



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/688,287

10/16/2003

Shoji Kodama

16869B-080800US

9177

20350

7590

07/08/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP

TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER

EIGHTH FLOOR

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

DAYE, CHELSEA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,287

Applicant(s)

KODAMA, SHOJI

Examiner

CHELCIE DAYE

Art Unit

2161

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42, 44-50 and 52-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-41 and 66-79 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 42, 44-50, and 52-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is issued in response to applicant's amendment filed April 04, 2008.
2. Claims 1-79 are presented. No claims added and claims 43 and 51 remain cancelled.
3. Claims 1-41 and 66-79 remain withdrawn.
4. Claims 42, 44-50, and 52-65 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 42,43,50,51,54-56,62-65, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayle (US Patent No. 6,356,863) filed June 1, 1999, in view of Dutta (US Patent No. 6,636,854) filed December 7, 2000.**

Regarding Claim 42, Sayle discloses a method for accessing data comprising:
storing a plurality of files in a file system of a file server (column 1, lines 54-57, Sayle);
providing a first export from the plurality of files, representative of contents of the plurality of files, to each of a plurality of client computers (columns 1-2, lines 65-67 and 1-3, respectively, Sayle). However, Sayle is silent with respect to a second export from

Art Unit: 2161

the plurality of files to a search engine. On the other hand, Dutta discloses a second export from the plurality of files to a search engine (column 5, lines 38-53, Dutta). Sayle and Dutta are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of file accessing and searching. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Dutta's teachings into the Sayle system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggested by Dutta at column 1, lines 41-54, in order to connect a peer-to-peer network to form a distributed file-sharing system. As a result, the search requests provide a useful manner for finding new content that has not yet been indexed by the search engines. Therefore, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose the first export configured to be mounted by each of the client computers, but not the search engine (column 2, lines 4-14, Sayle), under network file system (NFS) and common Internet file system (CFS) convention (column 6, lines 3-9, Sayle), the second export configured to be mounted by the search engine (column 4, lines 46-60, column 6, lines 23-34, and column 8, lines 28-32, Dutta); maintaining a mapping at the file server of the mounting of the second export on the search engine (column 10, lines 23-46, Dutta)¹;

receiving a directory list request for a selected one of the first and second exports (column 9, lines 37-55, Sayle)²;

¹ Examiner Notes: Even further, Sayle also discusses mapping of mountings and it would be obvious that teaching of the mappings for the mounting of export for the clients would also be true for the mapping of the mounting of exports for the search engine.

² Examiner Notes: The examiner has chosen to provide a citation for the selected one of the first export. As such, a citation is not provided for the alternative limitations, which further rely upon/discuss, the 'search engine'.

in response to receiving the directory list request, determining whether the selected one of the first and second exports is for one of the client computers or the search engine based on one of received export information (column 4, lines 38-52, Sayle) and an IP address associated with the directory list request (column 6, lines 21-33, Sayle);

in response to receiving the directory list request, producing a first directory listing that is representative of all contents of a first directory for the selected export when the selected export is for one of the client computers (column 9, lines 56-63, Sayle); and

in response to receiving the directory list request, producing a second directory listing that is representative of updated contents of a second directory for the selected export when the selected export is for the search engine, the updated contents representing changes to the second directory since a most recent export to the search engine, files represented in the second directory listing being further based on one or more criteria contained in a file filter table, wherein an index for the search engine is updated based on the second directory listing.

Regarding Claim 50, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose a method for accessing data comprising:

storing a plurality of files in a file system on a file server (column 1, lines 54-57, Sayle);

providing a plurality of first exports of the file system to a plurality of client computers (columns 1-2, lines 65-67 and 1-3, respectively, Sayle), each of the plurality of client computers mounting one of the plurality of first exports under network file system (NFS) and common Internet file system (CFS) conventions (column 2, lines 4-14 and column 6, lines 3-9, Sayle);

providing a second export of the file system to a search engine (column 5, lines 38-53, Dutta), the search engine mounting the second export (column 4, lines 46-60, column 6, lines 23-34, and column 8, lines 28-32, Dutta);

maintaining a mapping at the file server of the mounting of the second export on the search engine (column 10, lines 23-46, Dutta);

based upon receiving a directory list request for a selected one of the first and second exports, determining whether the selected one is for one of the client computers or for the search engine, based on one of received export information (column 4, lines 38-52 and column 9, lines 37-55, Sayle)³ and an IP address associated with the directory list request (column 6, lines 21-33, Sayle);

producing a first directory listing that is representative of all contents of a first directory for the determined export if the determined export is for one of the client computers (column 9, lines 56-63, Sayle); and

producing a second directory listing that is representative of updated contents of a second directory for the determined export if the determined export is for the search engine, the updated contents representing changes to the second directory since a

Art Unit: 2161

most recent export to the search engine, files represented in the second directory listing being determined based on one or more criteria contained in a file filter table, wherein an index for the search engine is updated based on information in the second directory listing.

Regarding Claim 54, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose a method for accessing data comprising:

storing a plurality of files in a file system on a file server (column 1, lines 54-57, Sayle);

based on receiving a directory list request for a directory contained on the file server, determining if the directory list request originated from one of a plurality of client computers or a search engine using an identification attached to the directory list request (columns 1-2, lines 65-67 and 1-3, respectively and column 9, lines 37-55, Sayle)⁴, the plurality of client computers each having mounted a first export from the file system under network file system (NFS) and common Internet file system (CFS) convention (column 2, lines 4-14 and column 6, lines 3-9, Sayle), and the search engine having mounted a second export from the file system (column 4, lines 46-60, column 6, lines 23-34, and column 8, lines 28-32, Dutta);

³ Examiner Notes: The directory list request is for a selected one of the exports for one of the client computers and therefore, the citation is provided to disclose such limitation. A citation has not been provided for the alternative limitations, which further rely upon/discuss, the 'search engine'.

⁴ Examiner Notes: The directory list request is for a selected one of the exports for one of the client computers and therefore, the citation is provided to disclose such limitation. A citation has not been provided for the alternative limitations, which further rely upon/discuss, the 'search engine'.

maintaining a mapping at the file server of the mounting of the second export on the search engine (column 10, lines 23-46, Dutta);

producing a first directory listing that is representative of all contents of the directory if the directory list request is from one of the plurality of client computers (column 9, lines 56-63, Sayle); and

producing a second directory listing that is representative of updated contents of the directory if the directory request is from a search engine, the updated contents representing changes to the second directory since a most recent export to the search engine, files represented in the second directory listing being further determined based on one or more criteria contained in a file filter table, wherein an index for the search engine is updated based on information in the second directory listing.

Regarding Claim 55, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose the method wherein the identifier is an internet protocol (IP) address (column 3, lines 19-37, Sayle).

Regarding Claims 56 and 65, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose in a file server, a method for providing access to files contained in the file server comprising:

organizing the files in a file system (column 1, lines 54-57, Sayle);

providing access to the file system to a search engine (column 6, lines 24-26 and column 7, lines 46-50, Dutta) and a plurality of client computers (columns 1-2, lines 67 and 1-3, respectively, Sayle);

storing information representative of the search engine (column 7, lines 30-39, Dutta) and the plurality of client computers (column 1, lines 54-57, Sayle);

mounting a first export on each of the client computers, under network file system (NFS) and common Internet file system (CFS) convention (column 2, lines 4-14 and column 6, lines 3-9, Sayle), and a second export on the search engine (column 4, lines 46-60, column 6, lines 23-34, and column 8, lines 28-32, Dutta), and maintaining a mapping of the first and second exports at the file system (column 10, lines 23-46, Dutta);

receiving a directory list request for a first directory stored on the file server (column 9, lines 37-55, Sayle);

producing a first directory listing that is representative of all contents of the first directory if the directory list request originated from one of the plurality of client computers as determined using the stored information (column 9, lines 56-63, Sayle);
and

producing a second directory listing that is representative of updated contents of the first directory if the directory list request originated from the search engine as determined using the stored information, the updated contents representing changes to the second directory since a most recent export to the search engine, files represented

in the second directory listing being further determined based on one or more criteria contained in a file filter table.

Regarding Claim 62, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose the method further comprising providing exports to the search engine (column 5, lines 38-53, Dutta) and the plurality of client computers (columns 1-2, lines 65-67 and 1-3, respectively, Sayle).

Regarding Claims 63 and 64, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose the method wherein the source address is an IP address (column 3, lines 19-37, Sayle).

Regarding Claim 65, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose a file server comprising:

- storage for storing a plurality of files (column 1, lines 54-57, Sayle);
- a file filter table (column 9, lines 3-8, Dutta); and
- a file server controller, the file server controller configured to perform the method steps of claim 56 (column 10, lines 23-36, Sayle).

7. Claims 44-49,52,53,and 57-61, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayle (US Patent No. 6,356,863) filed June 1, 1999, in view of Dutta (US Patent No. 6,636,854) filed December 7, 2000, and further in view of Hill (US Patent No. 7,020,658) filed June 4, 2001.

Regarding Claim 44, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, disclose the method having the one or more criteria. However, Sayle in view of Dutta are silent with respect to the criteria based on one or more of file types; file owner information; file creation dates; and file sizes. On the other hand, Hill discloses the criteria based on one or more of file types; file owner information; file creation dates; and file sizes (Fig.14, Hill). Sayle, Dutta, and Hill are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of file management systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Hill's teachings into the Sayle and Dutta system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggested by Hill at columns 2-3, lines 58-67 and 1-11, in order to easily and effortlessly identify unwanted/wanted files. As a result, causing the system to decrease intensive labor and improve efficiency.

Regarding Claim 45, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, and further in view of Hill, disclose the method wherein the file filtering table comprises one or more file types which indicate whether files are to be excluded from the second directory listing (Fig.15; column 16, lines 45-53, Hill).

Regarding Claim 46, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, and further in view of Hill, disclose the method wherein the file filtering table further comprises one or more of file owner information, file creation dates, file sizes (Fig.14, Hill).

Regarding Claims 47-49, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, and further in view of Hill, disclose the method wherein the file filter specifies which files are to be included in the second directory listing and which files are to be excluded from the second directory listing (Fig.11B; column 12, lines 41-46, Hill).

Regarding Claims 52 and 53, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, and further in view of Hill, disclose the method wherein the file filter specifies which files are to be included and excluded in the second directory listing (Fig.11B; column 12, lines 41-46, Hill).

Regarding Claim 57, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, and further in view of Hill, disclose the method wherein the file filtering table comprises one or more file types which indicate, by file type, whether files are to be excluded from the second directory listing (Fig.15; column 16, lines 45-53, Hill).

Regarding Claim 58, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, and further in view of Hill, disclose the method wherein the file filtering table further comprises one or more of file owner information, file creation dates, file sizes (Fig.14, Hill).

Regarding Claims 59,60, and 61, the combination of Sayle in view of Dutta, and further in view of Hill, disclose the method wherein the file filtering table comprises one

or more criteria which indicate whether a file is to be excluded from the second directory listing and indicate whether a file is to be included in the second directory listing (Fig.11B; column 12, lines 41-46, Hill).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to newly amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHELCIE DAYE whose telephone number is (571)272-3891. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4146080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chelcie Daye
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
July 3, 2008

/Apu M Mofiz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161